

R E M A R K S

Amended claim 1, and thereby all claims dependent from claim 1 structurally distinguish over the cited art thereby providing a highly compact, less complex, efficient apparatus in view of the follow now recited in claim 1:

g) said means including rotary members at least one of which exerts tensioning force on said at least one secondary line,

h) said means including spring means windingly coupled to said rotary members acting to urge said at least one of said rotary members in a direction for winding said at least one secondary line on said at least one rotary member, said at least one secondary line being the only means for exerting tensioning force wound on said at least one rotary member,

i) there being a receptacle closely confined in the channel and in which said rotary members and spring means are carried, said at least one secondary line and said connection remain substantially directly aligned in the channel with said at least one rotary member in the receptacle, during said

Serial No. 10/743,178

longitudinal travel of the connection in the channel, the channel confining said at least one secondary line to approach said at least one rotary member from a single longitudinal direction only, and so as to provide a protected longitudinal travel path for said connection in the channel toward said at least one rotary member, said at least one secondary line extending longitudinally and generally horizontally to approach and wind about said at least one rotary member.

In this regard, the teachings of Gertzson and Kuhar appear as follows:

Gertzson states that an object is to provide one cord emerging from a support box - that cord used for operating the blind (col. 1, lines 15-18) and, to stop his blind from going down at any position by pulling his cord 17 to the left (col. 2, lines 21-23). Therefore, cordless operation is not contemplated by Gertzson, and a hand cord is required for blind operation - his hand cord 7 passing through his rollers 13 and 14.

Serial No. 10/743,178

Kuhar requires two relatively angled lifting cords 52 to be wound on a cord spool 30 (col. 5, lines 13-14). He contemplates using more than two lifting cords 52. Additional cords may be used. He suggest future modification by using more than two lifting cords (col. 6, lines 42-46). His motivation is therefore to use two or more lifting cords wound on a drum, and approaching the drum from different directions, and not to approach the drum from a single longitudinal direction only.

Remaining cited art appears even less pertinent than Gertzson and Kuhar.

Distinctions over Gertzson (G) and Kuhar (K) taken separately, or together, include the following:

1. To combine K with G toward applicants' claim 1 requires (see h) and i) of claim 1) elimination of one of K's two lines 52, since they approach their winding drum from two different directions. Kuhar motivates needed use of at least two relatively angled wound lines.

2. Also, to combine K with G requires motivation to provide an elongated longitudinally extending channel (lacking in both K and G), and requires locating K's rotary parts 10 and 30 in a receptacle received in the channel in such a way that the non-eliminated remaining line 52 of K extends substantially directly aligned in such a channel with the rotary spool 30 of K; and with provision of a protected travel path in the channel for a line connection, toward member 30 of K. K has no such longitudinal channel or receptacle, nor does G.

3. Also, to combine K with G requires replacing the hanging portion of G's pull cord 17 with K's retraction means (see Examiner's analysis), and re-locating the dual members 10 and 30 of K at the position of G's cord lock 13, 14 and 16; but this would locate 10 and 30 of K vertically, one above the other, as taught by G's vertically separated lock elements 13 and 14, preventing reception of a receptacle for 10 and 30 in a straight upper elongated longitudinal channel. Applicants' rotary members and spring are doubly protected, by the defined receptacle structure and by the horizontally elongated channel, the connection also protected for and by travel in that channel. No cited

Serial No. 10/743,178

art suggests this, or motivates this, for the type of device claimed. K teaches need for two lines 52 approaching a drum from two different non-longitudinal directions, and such lines when wound could interfere. Applicants' simpler device avoids such complexity and problems.

In view of the above, there is no motivational teaching in K or G of how to combine, or modify, the contents of K or G to meet the simpler structure and functions of claim 1, as amended above, whereby claim 1 and all remaining claims dependent upon it should be allowable.

The remaining dependent claims (especially 2, 5-10, 17 and 18) add additional structure, unobvious in the totality of such claims, no cited art including K and G suggesting such totalities.

All other base claims, and dependent claims, are cancelled, to reduce issues.

Allowance is respectfully urged.

Respectfully submitted,



William W. Haefliger  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 17,120  
323 684-2707

WWH:ts  
Docket 12,569